

EX PARTE CRIMINAL FILED

6/11-92472

**From:** "Joseph D'Alessandro" <jdman@magpage.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(SFOX)  
**Date:** 7/30/98 8:33pm  
**Subject:** ?

DEAR FCC AND MY ELECTED OFFICIALS;;'

I HOLD YOU IN MY OWN OPINION, FOR THE DISCRIMINATION, AND RACISMS, AGAINST  
MYSELF, OLGA, WOMAN, BLACKS AND OTHER MINORITY'S.; FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS  
YOU HAVE TAKEN THE SUPREME COURT RULING  
AND USED IT  
AGAINST, WOMAN, BLACKS, AND MINORITY'S, FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS TO KEEP US OUT OF  
OWNING A RADIO STATION ETC.;

READ SUPREME RULING

In National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 319 U.S. 190 (1943), the  
Supreme Court stated, in pertinent part, as follows (footnotes omitted):

We come, finally, to an appeal to the First Amendment. The Regulations, even if valid in all other respects, must fall because they abridge, say the appellants, their right of free speech. If that be so, it would follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio. Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to government regulation. Because it cannot be used by all, some who wish to use it must be denied. . . . The right of free speech does not include, however, the right to use the facilities of radio without license. The licensing system established by Congress in the Communications Act was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard it provided for licensing of stations was the 'public interest, convenience, and necessity.' Denial of a station license on that ground, if valid under the Act, is not a denial of free speech.

\*\*\*\*\*BROADCAST FREQUENCY'S LACK NO  
LIMITS\*\*\*\*\*

THE SUPREME COURT, IN THERE DECISION DOES NOT MAKE A, DISTINCTION,; IF YOU  
ARE DEAD OR ALIVE

RICH

IF YOU ARE POOR OR

BLACK OR WHITE

IF YOU ARE

NON-DISTINCTIONS

IF YOU ARE DISABLED  
AND MANY OTHER

ALSO THERE RULING

2

DOES NOT GIVE, A NUMBER TO INCLUDE  
OR EXCLUDE, HOW MANY, IT STATES "SOME" A CERTAIN UNSPECIFIED  
QUANTITY, NUMBER, AND OR NOT KNOWN.;;

RULEING AND MADE IT A FALSE AND OR  
DERISIVE IMITATION,;;.

YOU THE FCC HAVE TAKEN THERE

RULEING TO SURPRESS, THE LESS  
FORTUNATE, AND ADVOCATE, SUUPORT, BIG BUSINESS, RADIO CONGLOMERATES, INVESTMENT  
FIRMS, AND THE NAB;;.

YOU HAVE USE THE SUPREME COURT

CHANCE, ITS ALL ABOUT MONEY, AND OUR ELECTED  
OFFICALS.;

MOM AND POP NEVER HAD A

Well me Mr.D'Alessandro, will struggle aganist you for MOM  
and POP.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

8/11-9247

**From:** "Joseph D'Alessandro" <jdman@magpage.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(MMOYD)  
**Date:** 7/30/98 8:41pm  
**Subject:** ?

401 7 1 1998

DEAR FCC AND MY ELECTED OFFICIALS;;'

I HOLD YOU IN MY OWN OPINION, FOR THE DISCRIMINATION, AND RACISMS, AGAINST  
MYSELF, OLGA, WOMAN, BLACKS AND OTHER MINORITY'S.; FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS  
YOU HAVE TAKEN THE SUPREME COURT RULING  
AND USED IT  
AGAINST, WOMAN, BLACKS, AND MINORITY'S, FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS TO KEEP US OUT OF  
OWNING A RADIO STATION ETC.;

READ SUPREME RULING

In National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 319 U.S. 190 (1943), the  
Supreme Court stated, in pertinent part, as follows (footnotes omitted):

We come, finally, to an appeal to the First Amendment. The Regulations, even if valid in all other respects, must fall because they abridge, say the appellants, their right of free speech. If that be so, it would follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio. Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to government regulation. Because it cannot be used by all, some who wish to use it must be denied. . . . The right of free speech does not include, however, the right to use the facilities of radio without license. The licensing system established by Congress in the Communications Act was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard it provided for licensing of stations was the 'public interest, convenience, and necessity.' Denial of a station license on that ground, if valid under the Act, is not a denial of free speech.

\*\*\*\*\*BROADCAST FREQUENCY'S LACK NO  
LIMITS\*\*\*\*\*

THE SUPREME COURT, IN THERE DECISION DOES NOT MAKE A, DISTINCTION,; IF YOU  
ARE DEAD OR ALIVE

RICH

IF YOU ARE POOR OR

BLACK OR WHITE

IF YOU ARE

NON-DISTINCTIONS

IF YOU ARE DISABLED  
AND MANY OTHER

ALSO THERE RULING

DOES NOT GIVE, A NUMBER TO INCLUDE  
OR EXCLUDE, HOW MANY, IT STATES "SOME" A CERTAIN UNSPECIFIED  
QUANTITY, NUMBER, AND OR NOT KNOWN.;;

YOU THE FCC HAVE TAKEN THERE

RULEING AND MADE IT A FALSE AND OR  
DERISIVE IMITATION,;;.

YOU HAVE USE THE SUPREME COURT

RULEING TO SURPRESS, THE LESS  
FORTUNATE, AND ADVOCATE, SUUPORT, BIG BUSINESS, RADIO CONGLOMERATES, INVESTMENT  
FIRMS, AND THE NAB;;.

MOM AND POP NEVER HAD A

CHANCE, ITS ALL ABOUT MONEY, AND OUR ELECTED  
OFFICALS.;

Well me Mr.D'Alessandro, will struggle aganist you for MOM  
and POP.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

11-9242

**From:** "Joseph D'Alessandro" <jdman@magpage.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(TPOWER)  
**Date:** 7/30/98 8:34pm  
**Subject:** ?

JUL 31 1998

DEAR FCC AND MY ELECTED OFFICIALS;'

I HOLD YOU IN MY OWN OPINION, FOR THE DISCRIMINATION, AND RACISMS, AGAINST  
MYSELF, OLGA, WOMAN, BLACKS AND OTHER MINORITY'S.; FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS  
YOU HAVE TAKEN THE SUPREME COURT RULING  
AND USED IT  
AGAINST, WOMAN, BLACKS, AND MINORITY'S, FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS TO KEEP US OUT OF  
OWNING A RADIO STATION ETC.;

READ SUPREME RULING

In National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 319 U.S. 190 (1943), the  
Supreme Court stated, in pertinent part, as follows (footnotes omitted):

We come, finally, to an appeal to the First Amendment. The Regulations, even if valid in all other respects, must fall because they abridge, say the appellants, their right of free speech. If that be so, it would follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio. Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to government regulation. Because it cannot be used by all, some who wish to use it must be denied. . . . The right of free speech does not include, however, the right to use the facilities of radio without license. The licensing system established by Congress in the Communications Act was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard it provided for licensing of stations was the 'public interest, convenience, and necessity.' Denial of a station license on that ground, if valid under the Act, is not a denial of free speech.

\*\*\*\*\*BROADCAST FREQUENCY'S LACK NO  
LIMITS\*\*\*\*\*

THE SUPREME COURT, IN THERE DECISION DOES NOT MAKE A, DISTINCTION,; IF YOU  
ARE DEAD OR ALIVE

RICH

IF YOU ARE POOR OR

BLACK OR WHITE

IF YOU ARE

NON-DISTINCTIONS

IF YOU ARE DISABLED  
AND MANY OTHER

ALSO THERE RULING

DOES NOT GIVE, A NUMBER TO INCLUDE  
OR EXCLUDE, HOW MANY, IT STATES "SOME" A CERTAIN UNSPECIFIED  
QUANTITY, NUMBER, AND OR NOT KNOWN.;;

RULEING AND MADE IT A FALSE AND OR  
DERISIVE IMITATION,;;.

YOU THE FCC HAVE TAKEN THERE

RULEING TO SURPRESS, THE LESS  
FORTUNATE, AND ADVOCATE, SUUPORT, BIG BUSINESS, RADIO CONGLOMERATES, INVESTMENT  
FIRMS, AND THE NAB;;.

YOU HAVE USE THE SUPREME COURT

CHANCE, ITS ALL ABOUT MONEY, AND OUR ELECTED  
OFFICALS.;

MOM AND POP NEVER HAD A

Well me Mr.D'Alessandro, will struggle aganist you for MOM  
and POP.